DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 398 JC 680 460

Automation and Agitation: Today's Junior College Student--D.N.F.S.M.B.* (*Do Not Fold, Spindle, Mutilate, or Bend); Conference for Chief Administrators of Student Personnel (Pacific Grove, California, January 10-12, 1968).

California Junior Coll. Association, Sacramento. Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel.
Report No-CJCA-6
Pub Date 68
Note-44p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30
Descriptors-*Activism, Automation, College Deans, Conferences, Demonstrations (Civil), Evaluation, *Junior Colleges, *School Registration, *Student Behavior, *Students, Vocational Counseling, Workshops
Identifiers-*California

After a keynote speech on how the dean of students can help bridge the gap between students and the trustees, legislators, and the supporting community, the conferees discussed automated registration--how to provide it with an acceptable master schedule, its many advantages, and a few problems. As for student activism, understanding must work both ways, taking into account non-student activities, the use of county counsel for advice on the legality of district regulations, the influence (liberal or conservative) of the surrounding community, and the very number of issues (single, simultaneous, or successive) that demand action. Hostile groups must be handled on an individual basis; faculty must acknowledge students' legitimate concern for curriculum development, grades, tests, etc.; alignments and special coalitions of campus segments must be encouraged to solve problems, not create them; and less attention should be given to the deliberately off-beat demonstrator. The dean should be prepared for extremes when allowing outside speakers and should try to involve all groups in continuing discussion directed to the solution of problems that, though created by the community, are expected to be solved by the college. The conference also covered the use of VIEW (Vital Information for Education and Work), instigated a study on the evaluation of counseling, discussed expected 1968 state legislation, and reported on the 1967 vocational guidance workshops. (HH)

CCA COMMITTEE ON GUIDANCE AND STUDENT PERSONNEL

REPORT NO. 5

Automation and Agitation

Today's Junior College Student

D.N.F.S.M.B.*

*Do Not Fold, Spindle, Mutilate, or Bend

CONFERENCE
For Chief Administrators of Student Personnel

January 10-12, 1968 Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CJCA COMMITTEE ON GUIDANCE AND STUDENT PERSONNEL — REPORT NO. 6

Automation and Agitation

Today's Junior College Student

*D.N.F.S.M.B.**

*Do Not Fold, Spindle, Mutilate, or Bend

CONFERENCE
For Chief Administrators of Student Personnel

Sponsored by
The Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel
California Junior College Association

Approved by
Bureau of Junior College Education
California State Department of Education

January 10-12, 1968 Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward: Dorothy L. Kearney 1

Keynote Address:
Automation and Agitation--Can the Dean Survive Them? 2

Automated Registration 10

Questions and Answers 12

Student Activism on Campus 13

Session 3
Vocational Information Through VIEW 20

Evaluation of Counseling 22

Sharing Session 28

Reports 30

Conference Business Meeting 33

APPENDIX

Conference Participants 38

Chairman: Dorothy L. Kearney, Dean of Counseling and Guidance, Citrus College, 1969

Conference Director:
Irvin G. Lewis, Administrative Dean, Student Personnel Services, Pasadena City College, 1969

Secretary-Treasurer:
Edna P. Froehlich, Head, Office of Placement Coordination, Merritt College, 1969

Members:
John R. Hiatt, Associate Dean, Guidance, Reedley College, 1968

John S. Hansen, Assistant Superintendent, Education, State Center Junior College District, 1968

Fred Humiston, Director of Testing and Research, City College of San Francisco, 1970

Samuel M. Kipp, Dean, Student Personnel Services, Sacramento City College, 1968

James McCamey, Jr., Psychology Instructor, San Diego Mesa College, 1970

Donald Nogle, Counselor Cerritos College, 1968

George Safford, Counselor Shasta College, 1970

Affiliate Member:
Dennis Mayer, Assistant Superintendent, Student Personnel Services, Mount San Antonio College, representing the California Junior College Association of Student Activities Administrators Association

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE CONFERENCE

Prepared March 15, 1963, by A. Robert DeHart

For several years, those in the public junior colleges in California who have been responsible for directing student personnel programs have been asking that a conference be held for the purpose of discussing the problems associated with student personnel leadership. The California Junior College Association Committee on Personnel and Guidance met this pressing need by calling a state conference for chief student personnel administrators at Asilomar on January 10-12, 1963. This conference was the first of its kind held in California.

Attendance of 70 participants, representing 48 junior colleges in California, indicated the active interest in the theme of the conference: "Student Personnel Leadership: The Key to Quality Junior College Education." The informalness of the site and the large amount of time allowed for presentation and discussion of current problems were conducive to a highly successful conference. But of probably even more value to most of those attending was the opportunity to become better acquainted with colleagues.

Two formal speeches were delivered during the three days of the conference and both may well prove to be of real significance in the further development of junior colleges in California. It is hoped that these speeches will be reprinted in journals of sufficient circulation to provide all of those in junior college education the opportunity to benefit from them.

Judging from the very favorable reaction to the conference and the feeling by most of the participants that the surface had barely been scratched, student personnel administrators can look forward to further opportunities for meetings of this kind. There is probably no other group in education today that stands to benefit more from a sharing of successes and failures. Improvement of junior college education should be sparked by this sharing. The Committee on Personnel and Guidance hopes and believes that such was the case in this initial endeavor.

DIRECTORS AND CHAIRMEN FOR ALL CONFERENCES

Date	Conference No.	Conference Director College of Affiliation	Committee Chairman College of Affiliation
1963	1	Bob DeHart Foothill College	Gordon Aumack Compton College
1964	2	Jerry H. Girdner College of the Sequoias	Bob DeHart Foothill College
1965	3	Marie Lantagne Santa Barbara City	Jerry H. Girdner West Valley College
1966	4	John Hiatt Reedley College	Marie Lantagne Santa Barbara City
1967	5	Dorothy Kearney Citrus College	John Hiatt Reedley College
1968	6	I. G. Lewis Pasadena City College	Dorothy Kearney Citrus College

FOREWARD

The California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel has annually sponsored a unique conference, one for chief administrators of student personnel. The conference has moved from being a vitally concerned and sharing group to a sharing-action group. The resolutions passed in the business meetings reflect the desire for an active position in the solution of student personnel issues.

The theme this year evolved around the contemporary student in an ever increasing automated-technological society. The problems of the "new student" are also the problems for student personnel workers, responsive to the demands of youth.

Much recognition is extended to all committee members, conference discussants and recorders for their efforts in providing a smooth running and meaningful conference. Special recognition must be given to Dr. Irvin Lewis, Pasadena City College, not only as conference director but as acting chairman in my enforced absence. We especially appreciate the work for conference grounds arrangements and for conference registration provided by Dr. Jack Bessire and his staff at Monterey Penninsula College. Additional appreciation is expressed to secretary Edna Froehlich, Merritt College, Dr. Lloyd Messersmith, Executive Director of the California Junior College Association, Ken Wood, State Department of Education, and Dr. Dale Tillery for their fine contributions.

The Committee looks forward to planning and executing future conferences of high quality and relevant interest for student personnel administrators.

Dorothy L. Kearney
Citrus College

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Automation and Agitation--Can the Dean Survive Them?

by
Dr. John D. Black
Director, Counseling and Testing Center
Stanford University

I am greatly honored and simultaneously humbled by being asked to serve as the keynote speaker for a group with such enormous and growing responsibilities for the welfare of higher education in California. I was especially titillated by the invitation to speak because it was extended to me by your foresighted chairman more than nine months ago, which I am sure is the longest lead time I have ever had for a speech. It's a pity I didn't take advantage of it. Actually, I think I responded to Dean Lewis by saying that "if I am still breathing by then, I'd be glad to come," so I suppose I should look upon my presence here as a blessing--to me at least.

I find making speeches a poor way to earn a living. It might be all right if you wrote a good speech and then used it till the corners were frayed and the jokes stale, but my problem is that I hate to repeat myself, and each time I speak I try to write a new speech tailored to the specific audience. It's kind of silly, really, since a man never has that many new ideas! The upshot is, however, that I only talk to a group when I feel rather strongly that they ought to hear something I have to say. The trouble with this is that if they haven't heard it elsewhere already, they probably didn't want to hear it; or else it's such an alien voice that they won't be able to hear it or won't like it if they do. In case you didn't catch it, that's a veiled warning that maybe some of you would like to leave at this point.

I will try to be polite because I suspect Dean Lewis may already be in trouble for inviting me. You must be wondering what I could possibly say that would be relevant to your problems. After all, I represent a privately-supported university, about half undergraduate and half graduate and professional, practicing very selective admissions and catering disproportionately to the sons and daughters of the upper middle class. Furthermore, I am by training and experience a counseling psychologist, and most of you have scads of this species on your staffs--impractical, soft-headed, bleeding hearts, shielded from the harsh burdens of administrative responsibilities, cushioned from direct contact with presidents and superintendents and boards of trustees!

Nevertheless, sometimes it serves a useful purpose to listen to someone who doesn't know your job tell you how you should be performing it. Furthermore, in the unique position of a long-time counseling director I have had the opportunity to be close both to students and administration during these years when automation and agitation have been making themselves felt.

If you're like me, your most concrete experience with automation comes through the hardware--copying machines that don't work, typewriters that stop when the power goes off, computers that break down on registration day. One of the serious and expensive frustrations of my position, which includes responsibility for a lot of research on student characteristics, is that every time we get the staff trained in one computer language and get programs written to handle our problems, the university goes out and buys a larger computer--and we have to repeat the whole process!

In terms of the theme of your conference, however, the significance of automation lies in its role as an agent and a symbol of change. Automation is abolishing what we sometimes call "idiot work," so now everyone has to be educated and while this demand taxes all of higher education, the brunt of it ultimately will fall hardest on the junior colleges and the graduate schools. The majority of you could probably use a staff person who did nothing but project future needs and plan for ways of meeting them.

Automation symbolizes for us all, I think, the rapidly accelerating pace of change in society. Technological change is a threat--to all mankind, because it can produce things like atomic bombs; to the adult population, because a new development may abolish work and make people obsolescent; to the youth, because the speed of change makes it impossible to predict easily what the world will be like in ten or twenty years. I am convinced that this is a profound source of anxiety in young people. For one thing it makes them increasingly apprehensive and critical about the education they are receiving and how well designed it is to equip them for that unknown future.

For most adults, including parents and deans, perhaps the most threatening changes are those involving modes of living and working, changing values and goals, changing attitudes and mores. Most of us were brought up with a rather well-prescribed set of values which we have accepted even at times when we have not lived up to them; they have been woven into the very tissue of our lives; an attack upon them becomes, perforce, an attack upon our person.

When one's whole life has been built around a conception that a man's work provides a major source of meaning for his life, it is disturbing to be told that work is not important. When one lived long with a faith in God, it is chilling to be told that God is dead. Having spent our youth being polite and deferential to our elders, we resent being treated without deference. We probably resent it more because of the many times we were obedient and respectful when we didn't really feel such behaviors were warranted.

Your lives and mine are patterned around fairly firm ideas of the nature of love, the place of sex, the role of a family. Let me read you a description of a course being offered by something known as the Mid-Peninsula Free University this quarter; I dare say it may turn a hair on even the broad-minded among you:

"SEXUAL MORALITY NOW--Among the young these days most of the traditional

moral questions are no longer even questions. Few, for example, would find anything worth discussing in the question of whether unmarried people should make love or whether teen age girls should be provided with birth control pills if they want them.

"But the new climate of permissiveness raises as many questions as it answers. For example, should (or can) a person love two people at the same time, and if one does can one eliminate possessiveness and jealousy by sleeping with both at the same time (i.e., in the same bed and at the same time)? The demand for exclusivity in love relations (i.e., serial polygamy) has resulted in enormous problems, but is inclusivity a feasible alternative?

"We will consider problems of tribal (group) 'marriage,' and the morality of orgies. (E.g., should one know and/or love everyone in a group before making love with the group?) Is bisexuality where it's at? And perhaps the most interesting question of all, what do you do after you are married?" Any of you care to sign up?

The problem is that at least by the time we are forty--and for some people much earlier--we are not programmed to seek change. Indeed, we have a hard time accepting it at all and we are very apt to resent it. Youth, on the other hand, healthy youth anyway, searches for the new, tests it, embraces it if possible, strives to make it their "thing."

A year ago this week I recorded a four-hour group session of Stanford girls talking about "the generation gap." I remember it so vividly because it was done at the behest of McCall's Magazine and the editor they sent to sit in on it was Lynda Bird Johnson; it's a little tough to forget playing host for three days to a half dozen secret service men--and a president's daughter. At any rate, over and over again in the discussion came the complaint that adults are always pushing for stability and fighting what young people see as exploration. Comments like "Adults are too afraid to question any of their values." Or "I can't talk about lots of ideas at home because my parents get all shook up." One girl asked me whether the current adult generation had been as conservative in its youth as it is now and added, rather plaintively, "I mean, is it at all possible that we might be as conservative when we're their age?"

Herein lies the major source of the generation gap, and if it is wider today it is wider because society is changing so rapidly in such fundamental ways. Oh, there are other sources of estrangement. I am convinced that most of us, consciously or unconsciously, resent the increasingly frequent reminders of the passing of time, of lost opportunities, of approaching obsolescence --yes, even of our own mortality: the aching back; the bifocals; the tightening girdles; the dentures; painful glances at that unflattering bathroom mirror with its wrinkles and bulges; the friends having coronaries, or worse; those irritating fashions that look so well--on people under thirty; the distressing dilemmas of aging parents.

Most of us do not come to terms easily with the reality of aging. One result

of this irritating confrontation is to predispose us to impatience with those vigorous, healthy, attractive, carefree, lucky, beautiful, irresponsible youth. When they are nice, and respectful, and appreciative, and happy, we may respond with a wistful envy or even a vicarious enjoyment of their blessings.

But let them become complaining, or demanding, or critical, or miserable--then understanding and sympathy come with difficulty. Don't they know what they've got! Freedom--opportunity--youth?

A puzzled girl told me the other day: "I tell my mother how miserable I am at school but she tells all her friends I'm having a ball."

Of course they do not appreciate being young--any more than we did at their age. It is only by retrospective falsification that we perceive our youth as having been so joyous and carefree. And we forget much of the anxiety, the doubts and fears, the loneliness.

We must also keep in mind that child-rearing practices have changed greatly over the last twenty years. The patriarchal or matriarchal family is pretty well dead. All parental authority has been greatly attenuated. Children aren't told any more to do things because father says so: they have to have a reason, and by the time they're adolescent, it better be a good reason, too!

The relaxation of arbitrary parental authority was largely inevitable and in general desirable. Some parents have erred in setting no limits and many have failed to develop relationships which enabled them to influence behavior which they could not control. But in general, our children are more mature and more competent in making decisions then we were because they have had more freedom.

If the generation gap is a problem to parents, it is also a problem for the student personnel worker. For while I have and will argue that he can no longer stand in loco parentis, neither can he do his job if he is unable to understand sympathetically and to communicate--and I mean a two-way communication process--with youth. Indeed, I will say that the dean cannot survive long who fails to adjust to these two demands.

I think there is much basis for a sympathetic response to the situation confronting youth today. They are faced with profound and disturbing questions to which there are no ready answers: How does one become or remain an individual in an increasingly crowded, regimented, automated world? How can a person count for anything in a giant, highly-organized system? They have been taught to ask questions and to think for themselves and in the process they have become adroit at identifying the hypocrisies and anachronisms in our society. What is so great about an economic system which leaves one out of every five people in poverty? How can good come out of the evils of napalm and bombs? Why send people to jail for smoking pot when the alcoholics in this country constitute so grave a problem?

It is disturbing not to believe, and the gravest danger we face with the younger generation is the growth of cynicism, for cynicism can lead to apathy--"tuning out"--or to nihilism, which is throwing out the baby with the bath. Either solution will mean, I fear, the disintegration of society. Adults who can talk with young people have a heavy responsibility to try to help them retain a faith in the democratic process, but we cannot do so if we are defensive about the glaring faults in our society.

Agitation on and off campus is here to stay; if the dean wishes to survive he must learn to live with it. Indeed, I would even argue that he should welcome it, for it is a symptom these days of a first-rate student body. I am a consultant this year at a number of western colleges, one of which is a private Catholic girls' school. The dean reported to me last month that they had had their first picketing--of some military personnel who had come to recruit WACS or WAVES. I told her, "Well Sister, it sounds like there's hope for the school after all." If you do not have on your campus at least a handful of students who feel strongly enough that we ought to de-escalate in Viet Nam to picket or protest, then you are poor indeed.

To involve the college administration in a serious struggle over some morally significant issue offers an appealing intellectual challenge to today's brighter, politically-sophisticated student. A game of chess is frivolous mental exercise when one can plan a campaign in the arena of political action. And a rally, a picket line, a parade, a vigil, a sit-in, is a marvelous release for the tensions generated by a competitive educational system. To behave in such a way that you cannot be ignored or belittled, to constitute a force that the highest authority of the university must not only acknowledge but negotiate with--this is to establish one's adulthood, to test a mature identity, to earn the respect due a skillful advocate.

Now if the dean is doing his job well, he will always know what is going to be agitated about, when and where and how. And he will have some opportunity to influence aspects of the program. For he will know what the burning issues are and he will have an established channel of communication with those students who are active in each area of student concern. They will respect him as sincere and honest and scrupulously above-board in his dealings with students. They will know that he is sympathetic with many of their aspirations even though his position may require that he seek to thwart them.

How does one become this sort of dean? Well, admittedly, it is not easy. Let us assume, first of all, a person of great personal integrity--a dean who does not say one thing to student leaders and another to the college president. I regret to think that we have probably already eliminated a few deans.

This dean is a man with a high degree of <u>intellectual</u> competence who makes a point of studying enough to retain the respect of faculty colleagues <u>and of students</u>. Some student personnel administrations are either anti- or at least non-intellectual. They haven't read the books the students have read in English or Western Civilization. They know little about the

theatre. They may even be poorly informed on national and international affairs. It is difficult for such a dean to cope with brighter students or enlist faculty support.

Secondly, this surviving dean reads and listens to everything he can which sheds light on what students are thinking and feeling. He knows the lyrics of their songs. He reads what they read, including underground newspapers, posters, propaganda leaflets, and books. He hears what they say, at rallies, in meetings, in private conferences. He collects and studies data on the backgrounds, attitudes, abilities, and personal characteristics of the student body.

Finally, he makes a special effort to establish personal relationships with all manner of student, but especially with the dissidents, the activists, the protesters. He must be willing to go to them, not to expect them always to come to him. If he has any long-haired, bearded, or barefoot students on his campus, he should know them--I might say parenthetically that the days of the dress code are certainly numbered--as he should know the leaders of the more radical student groups. I assume, of course, that he already knows the "straight arrows," the traditional student leaders, who do, after all, merit a major share of his interest.

There is very little anyone in the college can do about the national issues about which students sometimes agitate, except perhaps sometimes to applaud the students who have the freedom and the courage to dramatize certain problems. But the college administration can do a great deal to deal with those issues that sometimes arise within the institution and which pit students and administrators against each other. One can, of course, show a real concern for student welfare and comfort, devise ways to minimize the parking problem, or shorten the cafeteria line, or the registration ordeal. One can improve planning and forecasting so that students are not confronted with too many closed classes.

There is one area in which it seems to me that many junior colleges are living on borrowed time, are lagging behind the four-year institutions: I have reference to a failure to alter the character of the essential relationship between the student and the institution and the mechanisms by which they interact. Most such relationships are still based on what is basically a parent-child model.

This model provides a parental figure who loves and values the child and wants the best for him. The parent, however, regards himself as the best judge of what is best. He also expects the child, if he expresses personal desires, to do so politely, to show gratitude if the request is granted, and to acknowledge implicitly the parent's authority.

As I implied earlier, this model of parental authority is a trifle outmoded in much of middle class America, but even if this were not so, it does not transpose well to an institutional relationship. In a family, the authority structure includes a delicate system of subtle checks and balances. A

father's authority is restrained by social pressures: if all the girls in high school wear short skirts he finds it more difficult to forbid his daughter doing so. It is also restrained by the need to retain the respect and affection of his children, since his identity as a parent is derived from them.

When authority is institutionalized, on the other hand, the same checks and balances are not effective. With five or ten thousand students you cannot love each one--nor is an administration even likely to be compassionate toward a minority whose behavior threatens to be troublesome. Our institutions have become too impersonal to rely on a system of friendly discipline of the Mr. Chips era.

What we need is a structure which does not place on one or a very few men the responsibility for making the rules, enforcing them, detecting violations, determining guilt, and passing sentence. We need a system which really guarantees due process, for this protects the administrator from outside pressures pro and con and it protects the student from judgments rendered in anger. There is no doubt in my mind that the courts will mandate such systems in time; we might as well do it ourselves first.

The other aspect of the relationships with students that I wish to comment on is their involvement in the making of rules and policies within the institution. It seems clear that student government is going to wither and die on campuses where it is regarded as "mickey mouse," where it has no significant role beyond a merely social one, where it has no real power. I believe students should have a voice and a vote on most college committees and that the existence of meaningful representation may reduce the frequency of more strident ways of expressing their wishes. Of course, such students should be as representative of the spectrum of student opinion as possible, even though it means including some students who will be difficult to work with.

I do not want to advocate student involvement as a "safety valve" or merely because one can make a strong case for the justice of the consumer having a voice in the services he buys. Our experience has been that some of the best ideas about educational innovations at Stanford have come from student committees, and there are also many good programs which would probably have failed without the student support generated by their participation in the planning. You will have a better college if you are able to tap some of the talent--and the idealism and dedication--that students can bring to bear.

There is one final task I would like to impose on the student personnel administrator: that he use his insight and understanding to take leadership in interpreting the generations to each other and in bringing them closer together. Most of you work in institutions that are more closely watched by their surrounding communities, that are perceived as belonging to a contiguous area, and that are therefore rather directly subject to the attitudes and opinions of the adult residents of the community about

what goes on in the college. A good public relations program is essential, and one facet of it is helping the public to be more understanding and tolerant of the student behavior that threatens and disturbs them. Some of you may need to begin with your own board of trustees, or the board of supervisors, or other influential and vocal citizens like legislators and newspaper editors.

The obverse of the problem, of course, is to enable students to have a keener appreciation of the attitudes of adults, including trustees, and perhaps help them be more sophisticated about how one influences adult opinion. If more students had closer contact with college administrators, most of them would, I think, be more tolerant and perhaps ever more patient.

In any event, the informed and dedicated student personnel worker should be the best qualified person in the college to promote understanding and communication between the generations, for he is close to the problems which confront the administration and he understands the pressures which drive his students. It is a vital task--even a crucial one--to improve communication. For education will suffer--indeed, in California it has probably suffered already--because of the hostility and misunderstanding between students and adults.

It is also a demanding, perhaps nearly-impossible task. It is also unending, and success may not be translated into dramatic recognition of one's contribution. But after all, if you thought being a dean of students was a bed of roses, you ought to have your head examined!

AUTOMATED REGISTRATION

Chairman: Dr. Samuel Kipp, Sacramento City College

Discussants: Thomas Clements, DeAnza College
William Heffernan, Bakersfield College
Fred Humiston, City College of San Francisco

Recorder: Robert E. Allerton, American River College

The subject of automated registration was presented by the discussants in relation to their experiences. From this presentation we gained considerable insight into computer registration.

THOMAS CLEMENTS reviewed his printed program "The Computer Scheduling Program" in some detail, emphasizing beyond the printed page, the important advantages and disadvantages of computer registration. He pointed out the two absolute requirements which would assure a successful program are (1) a complete understanding of time blocking by the student, i.e., allowing the broadest extent of free time in order to obtain the best complete program, and (2) inclusion of instructor-time choice. He emphasized that the development of the computer scheduling program entails the complete cooperation of the instructional area in order to devise an acceptable master schedule before final printout of the student class schedule.

Listed among the many important advantages of computer registration were (1) a greater flexibility in developing the master class schedule, (2) a larger number of students receiving a greater percentage of their requests, (3) automatic and effective class leveling, (4) more readily available records and reports, and (5) a more complete counseling has been noted which includes (a) development of more meaningful alternates, (b) creation of better program balancing, and (c) maximum ease in obtaining major course and graduation requirements.

In evaluating the computer scheduling program, Mr. Clements warned against attempting to "interface" computer registration with manual registration. For the final registration days no attempt should be made to establish an early cutoff date on computer registration in favor of final manual registration. DeAnza attempted this and the program failed. The second warning was to thoroughly educate counselors, instructors, classified staff, and students in order to insure a completely successful computer registration. In general it was pointed out, the faculty was positive in its evaluation at DeAnza. Although there was some minor dislocation, instructors were generally favorable to the procedure.

Among the students, 77.8% indicated a preference for computer registration. The most commonly mentioned reason was the speed with which the automated system registered most students -- twenty minutes. There were some scheduling disappointments because of student work hours. This is a very realistic complaint and, as yet, there seems to be no easy answer for handling

student job hour changes.

WILLIAM HEFFERNAN of Bakersfield College had not printed computer program material but spoke on the subject of OPERATION SWITCH (sectioning with instructor-time choice). The majority of the participants were acquainted with the SWITCH program which has been in operation for four years at Bakersfield. For the most part, Mr. Heffernan concurred with the problems mentioned by Mr. Clements. He illustrated several refinements that have been developed since the beginning of computer registration on their campus. He reaffirmed the comments emphasizing the importance of the use of the time blocks by students and reiterated the need for thorough education of faculty and students.

Over and above the fact that the Bakersfield computer registration is handled on a 1620 rather than a 360 or the 1401, there is relatively little difference between the two forms of registration. One major difference, is in developing the master schedule, Bakersfield makes more frequent computer passes and utilizes student requests more frequently in the master schedule development. Mr. Heffernan indicated the main advantages of computer registration were (1) the master schedule truly reflects student requests and needs, (2) class leveling is effectively evident, (3) students receive more primary requests than they received under the manual registration. His final comment was a reminder that computer registration can only be successful through the coordination and education of faculty and students and a willingness to participate cooperatively.

FRED HUMISTON of City College of San Francisco stated from his experience, computer programming left something to be desired. At the end of their fall registration, his desire was to obtain quickly a six months sabbatical to Scotland. He commented that City College computer registration for fall 1967 led to the development of Murphy's Law, "If anything can happen to cause failure, it will." So many startling and traumatic happenings occurred during their registration, it tended to make the Haight-Ashbury situation resemble a Sunday picnic. The registration was a comedy of errors or a concerted effort in 'how-not-to-do-it, computer registration.'

Some determining factors in this monstrous fiasco were (1) City Work Study students threw their last semester's class schedules into the machine, (2) the fall 1967 semester was programmed with only one summer session's experience, (3) failure to rearrange coding for boys and girls PE courses, no recognition for "vive la difference."

Out of this black day of September at City College came some excellent words of advice and warning to those who are yet to advance into the wonderful world of "bits and bugs." Mr. Humiston's final serious advice to the conference was to plan carefully, ask the experts, and graciously receive any tested and suggested procedures. Do not attempt computer registration without a dry run and a prayer; then put your plan into action.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q? What is the effect of computer registration on the counselor-student relationship?

A. The computer program, once perfected, should remove from the counselor's hands some of the paper work and give him more time for professional service to the student.

Q? Should there be priorities for student groups?

A. Yes, however, this depends on your student body makeup and your school philosophy.

Q? Does the computer registration create the need for late instructor hiring?

A. If one abides by the difference of the final master schedule, it would mean late hiring. At the moment, this appears to be a disadvantage. However, it is a minor issue and eventually the solutions will be worked out.

Q? Is it possible to satisfy all students?

A. No. However, in defense of the computer it was not possible to satisfy all students in the manual registration.

Q? Does the computer cut down classified staff?

A. No. In fact, each case noted there had been an increase in classified, clerical staff.

In each session of automated registration it was noted there was insufficient time for the participants to thoroughly examine the subject. The chairman implied that, without a doubt, there would be more participants with more experience a year from now and perhaps this subject could be repeated at the next conference.

STUDENT ACTIVISM ON CAMPUS

IAIRMAN: Dennis Mayer, Mount San Antonio College

ISCUSSANT: Dr. John Black, Director of Counseling and Testing, Stanford University

ECORDER: Don Siriani, Cerritos College

r. Black requested the session be informal and did not make any formal pre-entation before each of the sessions. His presentation the evening before as to provide the stimulus for our opening discussion on Student Activism n Campus.

DISCUSSION

r. Black implied that one of the underlining themes or causes for activism n campus is attributed to the generation gap. More specifically, the gap etween the student and college administration. This gap could be attri-uted to the fact that the administrator represents the organization (the stablishment) and that he must reflect the attitude of the governing board. n most communities, the boards are conservative and reflect little under-tanding of the student and his problems.

Reaction to the Above Statement

. Deans recognizing the need for meeting with the student and discussing their many problems try to bridge this gap. But what of the expecta-tions of the board and the community that inhibit the administrator. A method to overcome the inhibited efforts of the board and community would be through special activities or programs. The purpose of these special programs would be to have the community, the board, and the students have personal contact which could lead to a greater apprecia-tion of the student's attitude.

2. Non-student Involvement:

Colleges must develop the means for communicating with the non-student so that he realizes and accepts that he should not have any more privi-leges than the regularly enrolled student. Example: The non-student should be made aware that he must follow the same procedure as students in requesting the use of facilities and distribution of materials. The non-student activists advocate they are being denied the freedom of the college and that the administration is infringing upon their rights. The non-student must be made aware that in a democratic society there are procedures to re-evaluate and revise a procedure that may be uncon-stitutional. But it must also be remembered that the rule or regulation is established to meet the needs of the academic community and the aca-demic community is the one that should ultimately implement a revision or a change in procedure.

3. Legal Statutes of District Regulation:

The consensus of the campuses represented was that the college has a right to establish rules and regulations and it is not unconstitutional to stipulate precise procedures and regulations in dealing with the utilization of facilities and distribution of materials. Example: A college in San Diego County obtained a County Counsel ruling to this effect:

A. That if students or non-students interfere with the educational process, those persons may be requested to leave or be removed from the campus.

B. The district has a right to develop rules and regulations governing the district's use of facilities and distribution of materials by students and non-students.

C. A Northern California junior college did not totally accept the above because they did not get the same encouragement or interpretation from their County Counsel, and the only sure way of knowing the constitutionality of your rules and regulations is to check with your County Counsel. It appears that County Counsel's interpretations varies from county to county. The importance of checking with your County Counsel is that they will be the legal authority that will be representing you in case of a court case.

D. It was indicated by another Northern California junior college that if you become too dependent upon County Counsel and set rules and regulations, you may be in difficulty. It was their feeling that students are looking for issues or campus philosophies which they may challenge. In many cases it may be more advantageous to play it loose and roll with the punch, treating each situation as it arises, than to have a too firmly structured procedure.

4. Community Influence:

The topic of community influence and expectations was explored. The community's influence on what action should be taken for various situations cannot be overlooked. The community college must assess and be alert as to the expectation of their college and the conduct of their students. If this is not done, the community may want to know or wonder why the college has not taken a stand in a particular situation.

A San Diego County college indicated they have implemented this kind of program by having a panel of both administrators and students in an open discussion of current problems. This college also had scheduled an informal meeting with all members of the Board of Trustees, a meeting allowing members of the community and the college to ask questions and present points of view. It was pointed out that in some circumstances the meetings with students, faculty, and community

have not always led to more appreciation of the issues. The Board, in some instances, come up with hard lines and more stringent regulations. This is the risk when Boards become involved; a hard line may be taken and can lead to unfortunate circumstances. An example was given by a Southern California junior college where they had a free and liberal policy for student distribution of materials that had been developed by and for the student body and it was quite successful. After many years of this liberal policy, a pressure group tried bringing off-campus materials to be distributed on campus. The publication was not authorized by the students and contained obscene language. A request for this non-campus publication had been rejected by a faculty-student committee. The decision of the faculty-student committee at the District Board of Trustees meeting was appealed, and a Civil Liberties Union representative made a presentation indicating the decision of this committee was in violation of the first amendment of the Constitution. The debate than began can a college regulate the distribution of material on its campus? This point may have to be resolved in a court hearing. A side note to the above situation is that the group wishing distribution of this unauthorized publication took out an ad in the school paper presenting their point of view. This campus finds itself in conflict even though they have had a very liberal policy.

Again we may have to ask ourselves is liberalism an answer to solving student activism on the community college campus? It was expressed by many of the Deans that it may not be the best way. It was further pointed out in the discussions, that many County Counsels do not have the answer or can you get a written interpretation. This leaves the school administrator standing alone.

Dr. Black was asked for his recommendations on how to establish guidelines for an evaluating device that has the same meaning to all segments of the campus community. Dr. Black's comments were that by his observations, there is no real single solution. Because many students are looking for issues and once you solve one, then another issue presents itself. Deans of Student Personnel have to accept this as a fact or as part of their job. As long as there are issues, there will be challenges and confrontations.

Issues:

A Northern California junior college indicated that because of the climate that is created by the multitude of issues, they have very liberal policies. There should be no censure of student publications. It was the feeling there is a danger in taking a position of censor. One must have faith in the student and many Deans of Students create their own problems because they lack faith in the student.

Dr. Black was asked to react as a counselor and psychologist to the emphasis given obscene or socially-unacceptable language in student publications. Discussion then developed around the question of

socially-unacceptable to whom? Dr. Black indicated that psychologists feel that suppressed people with little information have a desire to see or hear the unacceptable, be it language, photographs, etc. He also pointed out that there is no scientific evidence that using or seeing pornographic material changes the conduct of a person.

A. The utilization of discussion groups to help develop an understanding of student problems as well as arriving at a mutual solution appears to be an effective device. Dr. Black was asked to comment if he believed in the utilization of a discussion group to establish strong channels through which student problems are resolved. Dr. Black felt that if you meant by channels of communication you are referring to student government, he did not believe this was a solution. The reason student governments are not the vehicle for providing the solution is that they are too much concerned with just operation. You must have informal groups or channels where the Deans will meet with faculty leaders and students. Faculty leaders, as Dr. Black defined them, are those faculty members to whom the student turns for guidance. It is incumbent on the Deans to counsel with these faculty members. Deans must go to and assist the faculty member in developing a greater understanding and appreciation of the campus problems.

B. Dr. Black also felt that an assessment must be made as to what are the educational values of the various groups or organizations which are included in the channel of communication. Do these groups just react to a situation or do they seek to resolve a problem or seek to fine the cause of the condition or issue. Student personnel must not be out of the main stream of the educational environment of the college. The assessment of the program must be made on its educational value not just on its utility.

6. Second Session Meeting

Dr. Black's discussion with this group was primarily concerned with a need for a definition of Student Activism. Is it the same on all campuses? Are colleges attempting to utilize the word student activists as a term to classify all student problems? If this is the case, then that position is a dangerous one.

A. Dr. Black was asked about his reaction to "hate groups" -- students seeking recognition who do not want to debate or discuss, who just want to challenge and make demands. Is there a method to handle these situations? Dr. Black's reaction was you must handle these on an individual basis. It is difficult but you must seek the cause for the particular attitude of the group that is challenging. He reminded everyone that the cause may not be the same for all groups. The problem

is that our educational system does not teach us how to handle or deal with hostile activity. The deans of students are in a very precarious position because the hate that is reflected by the group is not a personal hate of the dean, but what he represents in the eyes of the student. The method that must be implemented in working with hostile groups is open and frank discussion.

B. A Southern California junior college indicated that on their campus students are actively seeking recognition and wishing to participate in activities concerning the classroom, such as curriculum development, educational environment in the classroom, grades, tests, etc. Dr. Black indicated that in the past the administrator has been under fire, a feature unique in American higher education. Now it appears that the faculty will have to be prepared to clarify the educational program. Faculty must become aware of this trend as more and more students on various campuses become more deeply concerned and involved with curriculum development and other aspects of the educational environment of our colleges.

To develop this awareness, there is a need for greater in-service training to apprise the faculty, students, and administration of the many issues and problems that face our colleges today.

C. Some campuses indicate problems that can be attributed to certain coalitions or alignment of segments of their campuses: faculty and students joining against the administration, faculty counseling the students, raising questions or presenting problems to the students and then the faculty members not wanting to participate in the solution of these problems. To resolve the problems created by these coalitions or alignments, deans of students must work with the faculty to whom the students turn for guidance, and educate that faculty group to the consequences of their actions and the need for them to help resolve problems.

D. A Southern California junior college felt that we give too much recognition to the demonstrator and lead many people to believe that he is the academic or the great thinker on our campuses. The hippy or the non-conformist on many of the community college campuses are not succeeding in the academic program and are using demonstrations and bizarre clothing as a source of recognition. It was recommended that more time should be spent with the real thinker on campuses, those who are succeeding in the academic program, and ask them what is their assessment of the situation for the unrest on the campus. Dr. Black interjected, beware we don't classify all off-beat students as poor students with academic deficiencies.

7. Develop Program:

A question was posed that we concentrate our efforts by working with distinct groups or elements on our campus. It might be advisable

that we develop a program that would bring all segments of our campus together in solving the multitude of problems that exist. It was felt that we work too long and too hard with separate groups just putting the lid on the extreme vocal and disrupting elements and in reality never solving any problems. It was the consensus of one Southern California junior college that we must involve all groups in a continuous program if we hope to do something about the problems before they take place. They realize that this is an ambitious task since the school cannot solve all the problems that have been created by social conditions in the community. It is unfortunate since the schools have not created the problem that many think that programs by the schools alone will solve the cause of unrest. We must have a program to keep the dialogue and discussion going on. We have to have a listening and talking session which should be more than a statement and a counter statement session.

What about the groups that will not listen? They do not want to discuss or talk. Their attitude being "don't give me the same old jazz". The reaction to this question was that we must have a program anyway. A college must avoid developing an attitude that because some segments of the campus will not join in dialogue and open discussion, we do not need a program.

8. Campus Speakers

A Southern California junior college indicated another contribution to student activism can involve campus speakers. The group discussion underscored the following points:

A. You must be prepared to hear the extreme when you allow an outside speaker on your campus.

B. You must be aware of the fact that they may receive outside support. In fact, the student may be a paid representative. The student who finds himself in this position has further reason for frustration. He now has two obligations: one to the campus administration and community and the other to the outside organization which he represents; and he must meet the requirements of both. This may be the underlining factor for the hostility and impatience of some of our students.

C. A college recommended the possible utilization of one student group to work with another student group in developing a greater appreciation of campus problems. One of the most difficult problems faced by some campuses occurs when the speaker demands that he have access to all students. Such speakers do not want a limited exposure or to be restricted to a designated area. If the speaker represents a minority group he may create pressure on students who are members of this minority group that hear him speak. This forced participation not only creates anxiety and frustration but gives a false

picture of the size of the activist movement.

In summarizing these section meetings, it was quite apparent that the schools cannot solve the problems alone and cannot stand alone. We must involve all agencies in the community. School personnel must become more aware of the living environments of their students. The community college cannot be a closed area which presents an environment that is totally foreign to the student.

SESSION 3

"VOCATIONAL INFORMATION THROUGH VIEW"

CHAIRMAN: James McCamey, Jr., San Diego Mesa College

DISCUSSANT: Laurance E. Coons, Grossmont College

RECORDER: Eleanor Kendall, San Diego Mesa College

The need for a system of keeping occupational information for junior college students accurate, complete, and timely resulted in the establishment of the VIEW project (Vital Information for Education and Work) in San Diego County. This was launched by a team from the Office of the San Diego County Board of Education who interviewed students, counselors, and instructors to determine their concerns regarding vocational information. The greatest single concern expressed was that such information is generally useless unless it is current and continually kept up-to-date. In order to achieve this, VIEW was found to be an excellent device.

VIEW's basic tool is a data-processing card containing a microfilm of four pages (8½ x 11) of information placed into an aperture in the card which measures 1 3/8 x 1 7/8 inches. VIEWscripts consist of two cards on a given occupation. One contains general information applicable statewide and the other contains both general information and local area information such as wage rates and prospective employers. The VIEWscripts can be used in a simple reader or in a printer-reader which prints out the material contained on the original four pages. The print-outs are for use of students, parents, and others concerned.

First occupations to be prepared for VIEW used in San Diego were those connected with health services. Updating information on these occupations as well as preparing new VIEWscripts on other occupations is being done by writers in the office of the County Board of Education. The office has been assisted in this task by junior college counselors who engaged in a summer workshop involving participation in various vocational areas.

As Grossmont College where VIEW is installed there is constant student use. The library has a list of approximately 200 vocational fields which may be viewed there or in the Counseling Center; print-outs may be made in the library. About once each month a new deck of aperture cards is received from the County Office with updated information regarding the vocations already described and with new vocations added. It is hoped that the establishment of VIEW projects elsewhere in the state will make it possible to exchange vocational information so that a student in San Diego could learn the job opportunities available in San Francisco. At the moment there are VIEW projects operating at the Stanislaus County Career Information Center and at San Mateo. Further

expansion depends upon federal funding.

While VIEW is now limited to dissemination of vocational information, there are other potential uses for this device which would be of much assistance to counselors. Presentation of information on financial aids available to students is one such use. A second might be a listing of articulation agreements between junior colleges and four year colleges. Still another would be transferring student records to aperture cards for use of counselors.

VIEW equipment is simple to use and does not require expert supervision. A card may be placed in the viewer for study, or, by pressing a button. the uses will receive an $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 print-out. This costs 10¢ and may be paid for by the user by the installation of a coin attachment. The cost of the equipment ranges between $1230 and $1450 depending on attachments.

The key to the VIEW operation is the accuracy and timeliness of the information it dispenses. Last summer a two-week summer workshop was held at Stanislaus State College for counselors to acquaint them with VIEW materials and involve them in their use of materials in vocational guidance. It is hoped that such workshops would continually inspect the vocational information offered on VIEW cards and recommend or prepare up-to-date changes as needed.

EVALUATION OF COUNSELING

CHAIRMAN: John Hiatt, Reedley College

ASSOCIATES: John Hansen, State Center Junior College District

Ernest Berg, Peralta Junior College District

Dale Tillery, Center for Research and Development of Higher Education, Berkeley

RECORDER: Vernon J. Warkentin, Reedley College

A. EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVE COUNSELING

Introduction - John Hiatt

When the problem of "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Counseling and Guidance in Junior Colleges" first reared its ugly head last spring, I felt like a man who had been asked to dive from a 100-foot tower into a bucket of water. Now that we have surveyed attitudes, collected evaluative data, and formulated a plan of attack, I feel like a man who has been asked to dive from a 100-foot tower into a teaspoon of water.

Last spring, I was called upon, as Chairman of the CJCA Committee of Guidance and Student Personnel, to testify before the California Junior College Advisory Panel. My topic was Realistic Counseling. Due in part to my presentation before the panel, but largely because the committee was unaware of any concrete and objective data about counseling, the discussions quickly centered on the value of counseling services, its justification, and the almost complete lack of materials by which to evaluate the effectiveness of our services. Ernie Berg was present at the hearing. We both concurred that this was a serious problem and was deserving of the attention of the student personnel people. We, therefore, elected to place it on the agenda of the CJCA Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel. A resolution from the committee brought it before this group.

Justification for our concern can be found in:

Directions and influences which may come from the new Junior College State Board.

Emergence of faculty senates and their influences on budgets and personnel.

State-wide clammer over the large drop-out rates at Junior College level.

Part-time vs. full-time counselor controversy.

Pressures to move from individual to large group counseling.

Ever-increasing emphasis on institutional research.

After 60 years, we are still questioning the value of counseling.

Some have felt that guidance and counseling programs have been carried mainly by administrative acceptance and support and not by faculty acceptance. Therefore, we had better get off the dime and do something.

We decided to make a three-prong attack on the problem. First, we surveyed the attitudes toward student personnel services of community presidents, deans of student personnel services or their equivalent, and presidents of the faculty senates, associations, or clubs. John Hansen was given that responsibility. Secondly, we requested all available literature, data, and studies which had been used or could be used in evaluating guidance and counseling services. I was charged with this responsibility. Finally, we would need, if our assumptions of favorable attitudes but a lack of informations proved true, methods and techniques of gathering the kinds of data we would need to evaluate effective counseling. Ernie Berg was to review previous research instruments and suggest the undertaking of a home-grown research project. However, after conversations with many people, Ernie has modified his original thinking and has invited Dale Tillery to assist with his presentation.

Our approach here today will be to review the survey of attitudes, review the availability of literature, and consider the possibility of a research project. Then we would like to get to the floor for discussion, and, finally, if you are so inclined, elicit a proposal from the conference to support and pursue such a program.

B. Opinionnaire - John Hansen

The opinionnaire with approximately a 50% return showed a striking amount of support for the counseling program. It was also interesting to note that the superintendents and presidents group fell between the deans of student personnel group and the faculty senate presidents group in the number responding.

Some of the specific responses to Item #3 are as follows:

1. The study should be conducted only after the State Board for Junior Colleges is operating.

2. The study should evaluate innovative attempts in the counseling area.

3. A study would supply evidence of what we now accept on faith.

4. We should have a clear definition of what counseling really is.

5. A study should be attempted only if the budget can afford it.

6. A study should not be attempted--vested interest groups would conduct and results would be biased.

7. We should counsel and not schedule--scheduling is not professional.

8. Counseling helps students through a transition period.

9. Counselors should be used in conducting the study.

10. Public, administration, and faculty need to be sold on the value of entire counseling program.

It is evident that at present there seems to be no way to determine the effectiveness of the counseling program. I hope that the proposed study will provide new information on the problem.

SUMMARY OF OPINIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE EFFICACY AND VALUE OF COUNSELING SERVICES IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

1. Do you regard counseling as an essential service?	Yes	No
Superintendents and Presidents	40	0
Chiefs of Student Personnel Services	55	0
Faculty Senate Presidents	36	1
TOTAL	131	1

2. Is the counseling program functioning as well as you feel it should in your institution?	Yes	No
Superintendents and Presidents	5	32
Chiefs of Student Personnel Services	9	42
Faculty Senate Presidents	5	29
TOTAL	19	103

3. In your opinion, would a major State-wide study regarding the efficacy and value of counseling services in California junior colleges be of value?

	Yes	No
Superintendents and Presidents	22	11
Chiefs of Student Personnel Services	38	12
Faculty Senate Presidents	25	9
TOTAL	85	32

C. Review of Literature - John Hiatt

I would be remiss if I did not first thank all of the people who sent literature and other data. As the material came in, I attempted to classify it into the services normally offered by a student personnel program--orientation, educational counseling and planning, vocational planning, follow-up studies, etc. Some of the material received fit nicely into the catagories I had established. However, most of the material assayed several functions in a single study and I had difficulty in classifying. For example, many studies tabulated questions concerning student characteristics, degree of satisfaction with instruction, degree of satisfaction with counseling, numbers of students entering on probation, etc.

As I read the materials, several factors became evident:

1. Many of the colleges are doing a great deal of work. The studies, by in large, were well done and indicate that we are attempting to fulfill the services of student personnel programs.

2. We know quite a bit about our students--height, weight, high school of graduation, high school GPA, family background, probation status, withdrawals, majors, follow-up of transfer students, and some follow-up of terminal students.

3. By and large, the studies deal with numbers and totals. That is, so many students did this, so many said this, so many students did something else.

4. The most objective evaluations were of some area other than counseling. How effective was the instruction? Did it provide you with the proper skills? Did you lose units? How was the food in the cafeteria? Were you satisfied with the number of volumes and facilities of the library?

5. Very few of the studies, other than a question or two, attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of counseling. That is, some studies did attempt to determine degrees of satisfaction with the counseling and advising services but few attempted to find the degree of influence counseling had on students.

Part of the problem might lie with my request for data. I very likely did not make my request clear. However, if my request was clear, what Ernie has to say takes on added significance.

D. The Research Instrument - Ernest Berg

In tackling the problem as to what type of instrument or instruments should be used for the proposed research problem, it was decided to seek the advice of the Center for Research and Development of Higher Education at Berkeley.

After a discussion with members of the Center staff, it was agreed that since the problem was so complex, the best approach would be to have a member of the Center staff take part in the Asilomar program. Dr. Dale Tillery was assigned this task.

COMMENTS - DR. TILLERY

Dr. Tillery's remarks were directed to the question of how such a study might be handled. He mentioned by way of introduction that the Center was semi-autonomous and responsible to the Chancellor at U. C. Berkeley. He also mentioned that it was national in scope and funded by foundations.

If the Center would agree to handle the proposed research project, it would have to be a cooperative one with student personnel people also involved. While the Center is interested, no commitment has been made at this time.

The Center has long recognized the need for such a study, and in some of its related studies, many seem to be taking a very critical view of counseling.

1. The proposed study could survey need and attitudes, but this should not be the major thrust.

2. The study should look critically and in depth at national models of counseling.

3. Experimental models should be established and carefully evaluated.

4. The project should concern itself with what to do with the findings.

5. It should be a research and development project, not just research.

Perhaps the findings should be used to combat the role conflicts that exist within the schools. The conflicts between presidents and counselors, between counselors and faculties, etc.

We need some fresh ideas, data, to conduct the study. While the study will not provide a miraculous cure, it should provide a new basis to solve some of the existing problems.

Though most of the comments were directed towards counseling, it may well be that the study should be enlarged to include the entire guidance program.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question: Do you view the counseling services differently now that you did when you were employed by a Junior College?

Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: Would there be any advantage to enlarging the study to include other states?

Answer: No particular advantage to enlarging study, but it could be done.

Question: How do you define guidance and how do you define counseling?

Answer: Difficult to define, but counseling is only one facet of the guidance program. Your definitions would also depend somewhat on the goals and objectives of your institution.

Question: Are the high schools doing a good job in their counseling programs?

Answer: No, they are concerned only with the four-year college-bound students and do little or nothing for vocational students or the one going to a junior college.

SHARING SESSION

SHARING SESSION: Thursday, January 11, 1968

CHAIRMAN: Dr. George Safford, Shasta College

RECORDER: William H. Meardy, Shasta College

The sharing session was generally devoted to questions from the conference participatants as follows:

1. What cutoff score are colleges using on S.C.A.T. to establish the identity of special students for counseling upon entrance? These are also the same students that are reported to the State.

   One college reported using the 15th percentile. Another college reported using the 12th percentile. A third reported using the 20th percentile but divided the students into three groups depending upon the area in need of development. Nine colleges categorize all students who enter with less than a C Average upon entrance as special students.

   It was reported that in some instances a course in career planning, study techniques, or career adjustment was required of special students and these students are assigned a counselor who is responsible for follow through.

2. Ten colleges make use of the provision of the forgiveness clause feature in the law.

3. Of the 55 colleges represented at the sharing session, 23 have a written policy explaining the use of the forgiveness clause for graduation purposes.

4. Only one college reported any problem concerning spectator behavior at athletic events such as raids across the athletic field or basketball floor and the use of yells and signs of an indecent nature.

5. There is a fear by at least one junior college president that there may be a question as to the validity of continuing to adhere to the open-door policy.

6. The disqualification law is poorly written with regard to those provisions that require the student to qualify under two sections instead of either section before he can be disqualified from college.

7. It was suggested that instead of using the term "pass-fail", that a better term to use is "credit-non-credit". A credit-non-credit

course will not be counted as an F grade against the student. This is a part of Title V.

8. A question was asked as to how many colleges are planning to move into the credit-non-credit area. Thirty of them are and fourteen are not. Further discussion of this matter revealed:

   A. One college is planning to offer at least one course in each educational division which will be offered for credit or non-credit. A student may apply for credit and a grade, but must do so within the next semester.

   B. One college stated that the faculty member is not told whether the student is taking the course for credit or non-credit. The faculty member submits grades on all students.

   C. One college requires the student to declare himself by the end of the ninth week.

9. It was announced by Santa Barbara that they are currently recruiting a woman coordinator of student activities.

10. A question was asked as to how many colleges are using classified personnel or student aides in checking prerequisites. Five colleges responded in the affirmative. Some colleges reported that salaries are sometimes federally financed. A danger was reported in that the students or classified personnel may get involved in counseling.

11. Nine colleges reported that their student bodies are participating in some form of a student self programming.

12. Eleven colleges reported that they are making a study of their withdrawal policy with the idea of lengthening the time during which the student may withdraw without penalty.

REPORTS

CHAIRMAN: Irvin G. Lewis, Pasadena City College

DISCUSSANTS: Lloyd Messersmith, Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association

Kenneth Wood, State Department of Education

Marie Lantagne, Santa Barbara City College

RECORDER: Ruth Novak, Imperial Valley College

LEGISLATION

Lloyd Messersmith reported that 1968 is not expected to be a good legislative year for higher education in California as it is predicted that the senate and assembly will be fraught with controversy and the need for budget economies. Education will be fighting a defensive battle, and the challenge will be to retain gains that have been made in the past session.

In summarizing the expected stand of CJCA on legislative matters and policies he listed the following areas of concern.

The California Junior College Association will continue to support the stand that there should be no tuition at the junior college level, but will support some kind of "permissive-mandatory" fee structure. It is proposed that such fees (parking, health, student-body) would be determined by local boards and that the local boards would also determine subsidiary sources to meet the needs of students who cannot afford the fees.

There is concern with the current concept popularly known as the "defined adult," and the feeling that a difference in support because of the age of students seems inappropriate.

Programs and activities supported by the community service tax should be retained, and there is opposition to any legislature that would negate or modify the intent or operation of the present interpretation of the community services tax.

Support will be given to any change that is proposed that will reduce the sixty-six and two-thirds percent required for school bond issues to a percent nearer a simple majority.

The requirements for employment are in need of revision, and minimum standards should be established. This concern has been reflected in the recently created legislative committee to study the problem, and CJCA expects to support the study. As the committee has been given one year to present recommendations, no gross changes in credentialing or standards of employment are expected this year.

Strong support is given to the creation of separate boards for all junior colleges.

CJCA vitally opposes the creation of a State Vocational-Technical Education Board for it would be in opposition to the newly formed State Board of Community Colleges.

It is expected that within a short time, announcement will be made of the establishment of uniform general education requirements for all of the State colleges and that the junior colleges will be able to certify the completion of a minimum of thirty-nine of the required forty-five units. (This is already true of California State College at San Jose.) It is hoped that the same thing will be true of the University of California within the next six months.

Continued support will be given to the intent of the Master Plan and to reaching the goal of forty-five percent State financing.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE WORKSHOPS

Kenneth Wood reported on the vocational guidance workshops that were held in 1967 and on the proposed workshops for 1968.

The three-week San Jose State College Workshop, in which eight junior colleges and ten high schools participated, was under the direction of Dale Burkland. Denny Auchard served as college coordinator.

The workshop was designed to give counselors actual firsthand experience in business or industry settings and provide practical knowledge pertaining to employment conditions. The most recent occupational information, including VIEW and other audio-visual materials, was made available to the participants; the theories of occupational choice were reviewed; and employment opportunities available were explored.

One day a week outside speakers discussed topics related to manpower needs, follow-up studies of junior college students, occupation-centered curriculums, services of the Bureau of Junior College General Education, the Civil Service Commission, vocational counseling, and the self-appraisal and assessment structure. Three days each week were devoted to visits to industries where the participants had the opportunity of studying entry jobs in aircraft, chemical, electronics, oil refining and the steel industries. One day a week was devoted to sharing the significant experiences of the industry visitations or reviewing outstanding junior college counseling and guidance programs.

The workshop was judged to be very successful, and it is expected that it will serve as a model for future workshops to be presented throughout the State.

The San Diego State College Workshop failed to materialize due to the lack of enrollment and the rejection of out-of-state applicants by local industries as it was felt by them that the benefits from the work experience would not be returned to the Southern California communities.

Excellent contacts with industry were obtained, the workshop program was developed, and the director, Dick Peerson, gained valuable experience and is willing to serve next summer in presenting a Vocational Guidance Workshop.

Three short-term workshops were held at California State College at Los Angeles.

The proposed San Jose State College Workshop for 1968 will be held during the regular six-week summer session and be presented as Course No. 225 HE. John Barr, College Coordinator of Counselor Education at San Jose State, and Kenneth Wood of the State Department of Education will confer to work out the details of the workshop.

It is hoped that the interest that has been developed in vocational guidance workshops will provide the momentum to establish workshops as part of a regular on-going program that will promote closer liaison in industry, counseling, and training in junior colleges.

RESOLUTIONS

Marie Iantagne, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, distributed copies of resolutions that would be presented for action during the business session.

CONFERENCE BUSINESS MEETING

January 12, 1968 at 10:30 a.m.

Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m., January 12, 1968, by Conference Director Lewis. He noted that recorders for the several sections of the conference were asked to have their reports in his office by January 19th, in order to facilitate early printing of the proceedings. He also commented on the fact that although this committee meeting was getting to be an established event at a certain time each year that he was having difficulty making reservations for next year at this time. He asked Jerry Girdner if he would name the conference chairmen since the Committee's inception. They are as follows: Gordon Aumach, Bob DeHart, Jerry Girdner, Marie Lantagne, John Hiatt, and Dorothy Kearney.

Before going ahead with the business meeting, Conference Director Lewis asked Executive Secretary, CJCA, Lloyd Messersmith, to comment briefly on the problem of the proposed establishment of a separate board for vocational education. Bill 43, recently introduced, would create a Vocational and Technical Education Board, separate from the Junior College Board. CJCA opposes such a board, feeling that it would emasculate the functions of the new Board of Governors before it has a chance to become operational. Vocational and technical education is very much a part of the junior college and it is felt it should stay part of the family.

Executive Secretary Messersmith also commented on the certification by local junior college districts that students have met the general education requirements, thus making available a uniform transfer program throughout the state. He noted there could be an exception of six (6) units at the state college which could be required if the college required them of their native students. He felt this expression of confidence from the state colleges is a great step forward, and hopefully we will have the same from the university system within a short time.

With the clarification of these points by Executive Secretary Messersmith, the Conference Director moved on to the next item of business.

Motion was made and seconded (Hiatt, Morse) and unanimously passed, that it would be appropriate to place a greeting and commendation in the minutes of this meeting to Kathro Frank, Sierra College, and William Olsen, Merritt College; and that this appreciation of their contribution to student personnel work and to this group, in particular, be conveyed by letter to them.

Conference Director Lewis next asked for a report from the Resolutions Committee Chairman Lantagne.

Chairman Lantagne read Resolution #1 and recommended that it be adopted. (Seconded by Hiatt). After discussion and two changes the resolution which follows was adopted with one dissenting vote.

WHEREAS, the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel has indicated by resolution that a study of the effectiveness of counseling be initiated as soon as possible, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Administrators of Student Personnel at their Sixth Annual Conference at Asilomar have considered this problem, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Administrators of Student Personnel concur in the resolution of the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel, and

WHEREAS, a survey of junior college administrators and faculty senate chairmen indicated that a study of the effectiveness of counseling would be desirable,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Chief Student Personnel Administrators request that the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel, after receiving the approval and support of the California Junior College Association Board of Directors, appoint an advisory committee which will take whatever action is necessary to seek assistance in initiating a study of the effectiveness of counseling in California junior colleges.

Supplementary motion proposed by Morse, seconded by Girdner that the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, located at the University of California, Berkeley, California, be the group to be approached to carry out the study of the effectiveness of counseling in California junior colleges; and that the Chairman of the Committee be authorized to convey this feeling to the Board of Directors of CJCA, although not necessarily limiting their consideration of other possible agencies.

Motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Resolution number two was presented by Chairman Lantagne. Moved and seconded (Lantagne, Schleibaum) that it be adopted. Motion unanimously passed.

WHEREAS, the California Junior College Association has an officially recognized Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel with membership representing all sections of the State of California and

WHEREAS, the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel annually sponsors a Conference of Chief Administrators of Student Personnel, attended by student personnel administrators from most California junior colleges, and

WHEREAS, the California Junior College Association has in the past adopted official positions on matters of concern to student personnel administrators (example, probation, disqualification, forgiveness of F grades, pass-fail, credit-no credit), and

WHEREAS, the annual conference of Chief Administrators of Student Personnel would provide an excellent means of ascertaining statewide reaction to long range proposed student personnel policies, while the Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel might serve to determine reaction to proposals which must be decided between annual conferences,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Chief Administrators of Student Personnel, meeting in conference on January 12, 1968 request the Executive Board of the California Junior College Association to refer student personnel policy matters to the annual Conference for discussion and recommendation, or to the Committee on Guidarce and Student Personnel for interim reaction between annual conferences, and

that the California Junior College Association urge the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges of California to fully utilize both the Committee and the Conference for discussion and recommendation on student personnel matters.

Chairman of the Resolutions Committee Lantagne presented resolution number three, with the motion (seconded by Mayer) that it be passed. After discussion and a change in wording the following resolution was passed by a majority of those present.

WHEREAS, the activities of non-students on California junior college campuses are causing increasing concern, and

WHEREAS, the University, the State Colleges, and the elementary and secondary schools have been provided legal protection,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Chief Administrators of Student Personnel, through the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel, request that the California Junior College Association Committee on Legislation seek state legislation to control the activities of non-students on the campuses of California junior colleges.

Chairman of the Resolutions Committee Lantagne presented resolution number four with the motion (seconded by Hackler) that it be adopted. After discussions and two amendments, the resolution which follows was passed by a majority of those present.

WHEREAS, the basic philosophy of the autonomy of the local district to establish the means of supporting student body programs on an equitable basis must be protected, and

WHEREAS, the concept of mandatory student body fees has been strongly supported by the California Junior College Student Government Association and the California Deans of Men and Activity Administrators Association,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the chief administrators of student personnel, meeting in conference at Asilomar in January, 1968, support the concept of mandatory student body memberships by option of local governing boards.

Resolution number five was presented by Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, Lantagne, with the motion that it be adopted (seconded by Stillwell). Motion unanimously passed.

WHEREAS, Dr. Dorothy L. Kearney has provided excellent leadership for the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kearney was the conference director of the Fifth Annual Conference on the Chief Administrators of Student Personnel and was to have presided at this, the Sixth Annual Conference, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kearney is representing the California Junior College Association Committee on Guidance and Student Personnel at the American Association of Junior Colleges' Student Personnel Consultants Workshop now meeting in Atlanta,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the chief administrators of student personnel express their appreciation to Dorothy Kearney for her guidance and leadership and indicate their regret that her official responsibilities make it impossible for her to be present to enjoy the excellent conference she and her committee have provided.

Conference Director Lewis again referred to the problem of setting a date for next year's conference indicating that the following three periods of time were all that are now available in early January:

M - W	January 6 - 8, 1969
T - Th	January 7 - 9, 1969
M - W	January 13-15, 1969

After discussion of these dates and the advisability of changing to a February date the motion was made and seconded (Hillsman, Reiter) and unanimously passed that the Committee be instructed to reserve the Asilomar accomodations for January 13 - 15, 1969 and January 14 - 16, 1970.

It was suggested, when Conference Director Lewis asked if there were any further business, that more information be sent out ahead of the Conference. This year the programs were not available ahead of time, but it was agreed that this was a good suggestion.

Motion was made by Hansen, seconded by Baker, that should legislation be enacted making possible the required purchase of student body cards by local board action, this conference express support for the provision of student body cards by appropriate means, to those who are unable to purchase them. After discussion, a majority of those present voted in favor of the motion.

Adjournment occurred at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Edna P. Froehlich
Secretary

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Robert E. Allerton, American River Junior College
Bert D. Anderson, Modesto College
Francis Andreen, Jr., Orange Coast College
Robert M. Baker, Coalinga College
Max Barber, San Joaquin Delta College
Irving Batz, Gavilan College
Karl Bengston, Hartnell College
Donald J. Bedard, Cypress College
Ernest H. Berg, Peralta Junior College
Jack Bessire, Monterey College
W. E. Blum, Ohlone College
Esther R. Bradley, Porterville College
H. L. Bradley, Foothill College
J. H. Brown, Antelope Valley College
Robert N. Burnham, Grossmont College
C. Harry Carlson, Los Angeles Trade Technical College
Lloyd R. Cassady, Southwestern College
Kenneth Castellino, Merritt College
Harmon P. Clark, Jr., Long Beach City College
Thomas H. Clements, DeAnza College
Laurance E. Coons, Grossmont College
Barry R. Curran, Butte College
Robert W. Deal, Columbia College
Irwin P. Diamond, Marin College
C. Garth Dougan, Santa Rosa College
Jack Fishbaugh, Chabot College
William L. Foran, Mira Costa College
Edna Froehlich, Merritt College
James B. Fugle, Jr., Santa Monica City College
Jerry H. Girdner, West Valley College
Russell M. Hackler, San Bernardino Valley College
Lincoln H. Hall, College of the Sequoias
John S. Hansen, State Center College
William Heffernan, Bakersfield College
Morris J. Heldman, Los Angeles Pierce College
Verle C. Henstrand, Diablo Valley College
John R. Hiatt, Reedley College
Mildred Hight, Mt. San Jacinto College
Ralph Hillsman, City College of San Francisco
Fred Humiston, City College of San Francisco
Loren R. Irwin, Merced College
Eleanor E. Kendall, San Diego Mesa College
Paul R. Kercher, Porterville College
Sam Kipp, Sacramento City College
Marie Lantagne, Santa Barbara City College
Irvin G. Lewis, Pasadena City College
C. C. Lovewell, Ventura College
Charles Lucchesi, College of the Redwoods
Merle L. Martin, Fresno City College

Ray Matthai, Taft College
Dennis Mayer, Mt. San Antonio College
James E. McCamey, Jr., San Diego Mesa College
Ronald McMasters, Moorpark College
William H. Meardy, Shasta College
Dr. Lloyd Messersmith, Executive Secretary, CJCA
Leonard C. Metcalf, Riverside City College
Dale A. Miller, Golden West College
Elbert Miller, Yuba College
Archie M. Morrison, Santa Monica City College
Philip D. Morse, College of San Mateo
Robert C. Nichols, Shasta College
John R. Nicklin, Los Angeles Harbor College
Donald G. Nogle, Cerritos College
Ruth V. Novak, Imperial Valley College
Dennis Paterson, Napa College
Bruce L. Paulson, Mt. San Antonio College
Gordon Peterson, Palo Verde College
Robert P. Pilling, Los Angeles Southwest College
Hope M. Powell, Los Angeles City College
John L. Reiter, Los Angeles Valley College
Malby Roberts, Cabrillo College
George Safford, Shasta College
John G. Schaub, Cuesta College
William Schleibaum, Compton College
Don V. Siriani, Cerritos College
Merl F. Sloan, El Camino
James W. Smith, Glendale College
Edmund O. Smyth, Citrus College
Leslie H. Standlea, Chaffey College
Russell G. Stillwell, Contra Costa College
F. D. Stout, College of the Desert
Martin Taylor, Sierra College
Tom Trawick, Santa Ana College
Leon Vawter, Allan Hancock College
Burt Wadsworth, Victor Valley College
Vernon J. Warkentin, Reedley College
M. Bud Weber, Barstow College
Osborne R. Wheeler, Fullerton College
William H. Wilson, Solano College
Kenneth A. Wood, Bureau of Junior Colleges-General Education
Robert L. Wynne, Laney College